

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT TACOMA

9 JOHN E. BARNHOUSE,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 HAROLD CLARK, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

No. C09-5527/KLS

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

On November 16, 2009, the court granted Plaintiff an extension of time within which to provide the court with services copies of his complaint. Dkt. 30. He has now filed a motion for reconsideration of that order. Dkt. 32.

Plaintiff filed his complaint in this action on August 27, 2009, along with an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Dkt. 1. Plaintiff was granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* on October 6, 2009 (Dkt. 15) and his complaint was filed (Dkt. 16). On October 9, 2009, the court ordered Plaintiff to return the appropriate number of service copies of his complaint for service on each named defendant on or before October 30, 2009. Dkt. 22. Plaintiff was advised that if he failed to do so, the court would recommend dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute. *Id.* The October 30th deadline was extended until November 13, 2009, after Plaintiff filed a request for clarification of the court's October 9, 2009 Order. Dkts. 24 and 27. On

ORDER - 1

1 October 20, 2009, Plaintiff moved for a six month extension of time to provide service copies of
2 his complaint. Dkt. 25. The court granted an extension until December 18, 2009. Dkt. 30.¹

3 In his motion for reconsideration of the court's latest extension of time (Dkt. 30), Plaintiff
4 claims that a Washington Administrative Code 137-28-330 finding of not guilty proves the merit
5 of his claim of a Fourteenth Amendment violation. Dkt. 32, p. 1. Plaintiff also states that only
6 two copies of his complaint are needed to serve the Attorney General's office. *Id.*, p. 2.
7

8 After carefully reviewing the motion for reconsideration and the record, the court

9 **ORDERS** as follows:

10 (1) Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 32) is **DENIED**. Motions for
11 reconsideration are disfavored and will ordinarily be denied in the "absence of a showing of
12 manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not
13 have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." Local Rule CR
14 7(h)(1). Here, plaintiff has identified no error in the court's order, nor presented any new facts or
15 legal authority suggesting that reconsideration is appropriate.

16 (2) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to plaintiff and to the Honorable
17 Ronald B. Leighton.

18
19
20 **DATED** this 1st day of December, 2009.

21
22 
23 Karen L. Strombom
24 United States Magistrate Judge
25
26

¹ Plaintiff filed a second, similar motion for an extension of time on November 10, 2009. Dkt. 29. That motion was denied as moot as the court had already granted an extension of Plaintiff's deadline. Dkt. 32.